

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (US 6,671,025).

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. in view of Miyazaki et al. (US 5,978,061) and Yanagawa et al. (US 6,583,846).

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-9 are objected to for various informalities.

The drawings are objected to under 35 CFR 1.83(a).

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indication that claims 4 and 8 contain allowable subject matter.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 8, and 9 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are pending for consideration.

**Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to under 35 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part, “a TFT substrate including a plurality of pixels.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings comply with the requirements of 35 CFR 1.83(a), and show every feature specified in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings under 35 CFR 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants respectfully request acceptance and entry of the Replacement Drawings filed on December 21, 2003, and respectfully request an indication that these Replacement Drawings have been accepted and entered in the next communication from the Office.

**Objections to the Claims**

Claims 1-9 are objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5, and 9 in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 1-9 be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's position that claim 1 is not enabled by Applicants' disclosure, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "a TFT substrate including a plurality of pixels." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, claims 4 and 8 both recite "at least one protrusion extending from each of four sides of the square shape," which allegedly is not described in the specification. Although Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's position that claims 4 and 8 are not enabled by Applicants' disclosure, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 8 to recite, in part, "a protrusion extending from each of four sides of the square shape." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 8 comply with the requirements

of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to disclose the best mode contemplated by the inventor. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As instructed by MPEP 2165.03, “[t]he Examiner should assume that the best mode is disclosed in the application, unless evidence is presented that is inconsistent with that assumption.” Furthermore, “[t]he information that is necessary to form the basis for a rejection based on the failure to set forth the best mode is rarely accessible to the examiner, but is generally uncovered during discovery procedures in interference, litigation, or other *inter partes* proceedings.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the best mode is disclosed in the application, and the requirement to disclose critically of specification measurement ranges is unnecessary and improper. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (US 6,671,025), and claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. in view of Miyazaki et al. (US 5,978,061) and Yanagawa et al. (US 6,583,846). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, recite an LCD device including a plurality of column spacers that are each “separated from one another and are disposed at intersections of the gate and data lines.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Ikeda et al. teaches different arrangements of continuous zig-zag projection patterns that extend across pixel regions of a TFT

substrate. In further contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, both Miyazaki et al. and Yanagawa et al. are completely silent with respect to placing column spacers at intersections of gate and data lines. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Ikeda et al., Mitazaki et al., and/or Yanagawa et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest an LCD device including a plurality of column spacers that are each "separated from one another and are disposed at intersections of the gate and data lines," as recited by amended independent claims 1 and 5, and hence dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Ikeda et al., Mitazaki et al., and Yanagawa et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest Applicants' claimed features of independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, and hence dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: August 19, 2004

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000